This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

Amendments to the Claims

1. (Twice Amended) A method for producing a silicone mold useful for baking a food product comprising the steps of:

   (a) preparing a flexible and foldable mould, said mould being formed essentially [by] from a heat curable silicone elastomer material [obtained] by cross-linking [the] said silicone elastomer in the presence of a peroxide as a cross-linking agent;

   (b) baking said mould at an elevated temperature for a period of time sufficient to obtain a flexible and foldable mould product;

   © rinsing said baked mould with boiling water for a period of time sufficient to remove the odor of the peroxide cross-linking agent therefrom; and,

   (d) cleaning said rinsed mould by exposing it to ultrasonic treatment.

2. (Previously Canceled)

3. (Previously Amended)

4. (Previously Canceled)

5. (Previously Amended)

6. (Original)

7. (Original)

8. (Original)

9. (Original)

10. (Original)

11. (Previously Added)

There is no suggestion, much less disclosure, in the LaGarde, et.al patent of a flexible and foldable mould useful for baking a food product nor a means for removing the odor of a peroxide cross-linking agent by rinsing the formed mould with boiling water nor cleaning the rinsed mould by subjecting it to ultrasonic treatment all as set forth in applicant's claimed invention.

The Llorente Hompenera patent discloses using a methyl-vinyl-polysiloxane to produce baking and confectionery molds (Col. 2, ll. 20 - 24 and 65 - 67). The methyl-vinyl-polysiloxane mold is obtained by a cross-linking process using platinum as a cross-linking agent (Col. 3, ll. 34 - 50). Platinum is the cross-linking agent of choice as it does not produce toxic peroxide residues or odors (Col. 4, ll. 3 - 6). The polymerization process includes molding the ethyl-vinyl-polysiloxane in the presence of the platinum cross-linking agent at an elevated temperature to obtain a mold; post-curing the mold in a hot air oven or forced circulation oven; and. placing the post-cured product in an industrial washer/dryer (Col. 4. ll. 11 - 21).

The use of platinum as a cross-linking agent in the Llorente Hompenera process instead of a peroxide is submitted to be a teaching directly away from applicant's claimed process. Furthermore, applicant's claimed process includes rinsing the molded product obtained in boiling water, not in an industrial washer/dryer. In addition, there is no suggestion, much less disclosure, in the Llorente Hompenera patent of exposing the product to ultrasonic treatment.

The patent to White discloses a curable organopolysiloxane composition having controlled flow to produce dental impressions and protective mouthpieces. (Col. 1, ll. 9-15). The composition ingredients include a curable organopolysiloxane polymer, a peroxide curing agent, a reinforcing silica filler and a flowable, resilient reaction product of a polyorganopolysiloxane, a boron-oxygen compound, and ferric chloride. (Col. 1, ll. 62-67) The compositions are obtained by forming a uniform mixture of the polyorganosiloxane, the boron-oxygen compound and ferric chloride; heating and agitating (mixing) the mixture until its viscosity increases; then, allowing the mixture to cool to room temperature. (Col. 3, ll. 55-61)

In applicant's claimed invention, the mould obtained involves the reaction of only two components, not four components as in the patent to White. Furthermore, the dental impression and protective mouthpiece products of the White patent have no resemblance to the cooking and baking mould of applicant's invention. There is no suggestion, much less disclosure, in the White patent of rinsing a moulded product in boiling water to remove peroxide odors nor of cleaning the mould by exposing it to ultrasonic treatment.

The patent to Phipps, et.al. discloses a process for removing impurities from unoriented polymers by contacting them with a cavitable liquid in the presence of ultrasonic energy (Col. 2, ll. 7 - 24).

The siloxane used in applicant's claimed process; i.e. dimethyl-vinyl-polysiloxane, is an oriented polymer, not an unoriented polymer and the mould obtained is subjected to ultrasonic treatment to clean the mould, not remove impurities. In addition, applicant's claimed process does not include the use of a cavitable liquid during the ultrasonic treatment as is *required* in the Phipps, et.al. process.. There is no suggestion, much less disclosure, in the Phipps, et.al. patent of producing silicone baking moulds which are the products of applicant' claimed invention.

The Japanese Abstract discloses washing a silicon wafer used as a semiconductor element. The continuous washing of the silicone wafer includes:

- dipping the wafer in a non-combustible volatile solvent having a boiling point of less than 100 C;
- washing the dipped wafer ultrasonically;
- dipping the ultrasonically washed wafer in water heated to the boiling point of the organic solvent to evaporate the organic solvent;
- dipping the solvent free wafer in pure water; and,
- subjecting the wafer to additional ultrasonic treatment.

It is respectfully submitted that the silicone wafer of the Japanese Abstract can not be equated with the silicone elastomer of applicant's claimed invention nor does the Japanese Abstract suggest or disclose the use of any cross-linking agent. In addition, the silicone wafer semiconductor elements of the Japanese Abstract are typically rigid products, not flexible and foldable moulds for baking food products as in applicant' claimed invention. Furthermore, the process of the Japanese Abstract does not include the use of boiling water as in applicant's process whereas applicant's process does not include the use of any type of solvent. Finally, applicant's process uses only one ultrasonic treatment, not two as disclosed in the Japanese Abstract.

In support of the rejection of the claims presently in this case, *five* references, three of them brand new, have been combined in an effort to find applicant's claimed invention "obvious". It is respectfully submitted that such a combination supports novelty, not obviousness.

In view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing remarks it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited and applied references, whether considered singly or in combination, render applicant's claimed invention obvious. Favorable reconsideration of this case and passing the claims herein to an early issue are, therefor, respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0515.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen E. Feldman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 22,473

12 East 41st Street
New York, NY 10017

212-532-8585

"I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS AND IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
ON May 24, 2004